

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

201

201

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/974,545	11/19/97	FARMER	C 2207/4641

KENYON AND KENYON
1500 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 700
WASHINGTON DC 20005

MMC1/0627

EXAMINER

LEA EDMONDS, L.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2835	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/974,545	Applicant(s) Christopher B. Farmer
	Examiner Lisa S. Lea-Edmonds	Group Art Unit 2835

Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 4, 2000

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 05/04/00 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/974,545 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sangveraphunsiri. With respect to claims 16 and 17, Sangveraphunsiri discloses the method steps as claimed (see for example figures 21 and 22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2835

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa et al.. With respect to claims 1-4 and 8, Sangveraphunsiri discloses a computer system with a processor cartridge (520) displaced from the motherboard and having an edge connector (546), a processor (108), a motherboard connector (548') to be mounted on a motherboard (104), a lock (see for example figure 15), and guides to restrain the processor (see for example figures 21 and 22). However, Sangveraphunsiri lacks a clear teaching of the guide rails and guide slots structure and the motherboard being connected to the edge connector in a parallel orientation as claimed. Hayakawa et al. teaches a mounting board unit having a motherboard (1-1) with a connector (1-2) being connected in a parallel orientation to the edge connector (2-3) of a processor board (2-1), and guide rails, guide slots, and the motherboard being connected to the edge connector in a parallel orientation as claimed (see for example any of figures 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hayakawa et al. into the apparatus of Sangveraphunsiri to protect the connectors from damage do to misalignment. With respect to claim 5, both Sangveraphunsiri and Hayakawa et al. teach a case having an interior side and an exterior side, however neither teaches the processor being visible from the exterior side. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the processor visible from an external side to allow the user and/or the repair person to select the

Art Unit: 2835

correct model processor prior to repair. With respect to claims 9-11, Sangveraphunsiri teaches a processor cartridge having a lock (572) and a plate (510) covering the slot, however, Sangveraphunsiri lacks the lock being a teeth lock or a spring lock and the plate being clear. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any of the well known means to secure the cartridge processor into the computer to prevent theft and also to provide the computer with a clear slot cover to allow the user to view the cartridge processor.

6. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Feightner et al.. With respect to claims 6 and 7, Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa et al. teaches the invention as claimed in claim 1, however Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa et al. lacks the processor and/or the motherboard having a heat sink. Feightner et al. teaches a heat sink support being connected to the processor via the motherboard (see for example column 3 lines 20-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Feightner et al. into the apparatus of Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa et al. to provide the processor and/or motherboard with a heat sink as it is a well known devices use to remove heat.

7. Claims 12-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa et al. and further in view of Freer et al.. With respect to claims 12-15, Sangveraphunsiri discloses a computer system with a processor cartridge (520)

Art Unit: 2835

displaced from a mother board and having an edge connector (546), a processor (108), a motherboard connector (548') to be mounted on a motherboard (104), a lock (see for example figure 15), and guides to restrain the processor (see for example figures 21 and 22). However, Sangveraphunsiri lacks a clear teaching of the guide rails and guide slots structure and the motherboard being connected to the edge connector in a parallel orientation and a motherboard having a receiving slot for receiving a processor as claimed. Hayakawa et al. teaches a mounting board unit having a motherboard (1-1) with a connector (1-2) being connected in a parallel orientation to the edge connector (2-3) of a processor board (2-1), and guide rails, guide slots, and the motherboard being connected to the edge connector in a parallel orientation as claimed (see for example any of figures 1-5). Freer et al. teaches a motherboard having a receiving slot for receiving a processor (see for example any of figures 4-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hayakawa et al. and Freer et al. into the apparatus of Sangveraphunsiri to protect the motherboard and processor connectors from damage do to misalignment. With respect to claim 18, the apparatus of Sangveraphunsiri as modified by the teachings of Hayakawa et al. and Freer et al. would inherently teach the method claims as claimed.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 08/11/99 and the "pre amendment" filed 05/04/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to applicant's arguments, the examiner

Art Unit: 2835

believes that the above rejection of claims teaches the claimed invention. The proposed modification of Sangveraphunsiri by substituting the perpendicular edge connector with the parallel edge connector of Hayakawa which would allow a processor and/or other electronic devices to be connected to the motherboard in a parallel relation. With respect to applicant's argument toward Sangveraphunsiri's teaching of the module being vertical to the motherboard; the examiner believes Hayakawa's teaching of a motherboard with a connector which allows for a parallel connection, as is well known in the art, would in fact motivate someone of ordinary skill in the art to modify the motherboard edge connector in such a fashion as it has been held that where a part of a device (in this instant case both the motherboard and/or it's edge connector) may be relocated (in a position that would allow for parallel connection) without modification to the operation of the device, such a relocation is considered to have been within the skill of the art.

In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (1950). Also, as seen in Sangveraphunsiri figures 21 and 22, the processor cartridge (520) is both horizontal/parallel to and displaced from the motherboard. Thus giving one skilled in the art motivation to incorporate the teachings of Hayakawa or merely to remove the cable connector and make a direct connection between the motherboard and the processor cartridge. With respect to applicant's argument toward the elements stated concerning the apparatus of Hayakawa, it is noted that Hayakawa et al. is relied upon for it's teaching of a motherboard having an edge connector which allows for parallel connection.

Art Unit: 2835

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Lea-Edmonds whose telephone number is (703) 305-0265. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, L. Picard, can be reached on (703) 308-0538. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3431,32

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1782.



LL-E
LL-E

June 22, 2000

Leo P. Picard
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800